



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/622,079

07/16/2003

Kenneth L. Levy

P0856

1849

23735 7590 08/18/2009
DIGIMARC CORPORATION
9405 SW GEMINI DRIVE
BEAVERTON, OR 97008

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2437

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/622,079	Applicant(s) LEVY ET AL.	
	Examiner JEFFERY WILLIAMS	Art Unit 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30, 36 – 55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30, 36 – 55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on 5/12/09.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

Claims 30, 36 – 55 are pending.

In view of the appeal brief filed on 5/12/09, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY
REOPENED. Additional rejections are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the
following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply
under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed
by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and
appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth
in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant
must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by
signing below.

/Nasser G Moazzami/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the added features of “monitoring or analyzing a content item”, “a list of content items... comprising a subset of content items designated as active”, “the list of content items being respectively associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the content items themselves”, “deriving at least one fingerprint”, “each item on the list of content items being respectively associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the respective content item itself”, “receiving a playlist, the playlist identifying ...”, “based at least in part on the playlist”, “updating the list of content items by adding at least a plurality of content items and removing at least a plurality of content items, but not all of the content items from the list”; “deriving at least one fingerprint from a content item monitored or analyzed from the network”; “interrogating the list of content items with at least one derived fingerprint”, “receiving a list of content items, with each item on the list of content items being associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the respective content item itself”, “adding and deleting entries in a table or data structure according to the list of content items”; “identifying a subset of the limited list of content items as active content items, the subset being associated with those content items being subject to updates”; “deriving at least one fingerprint from a content item monitored or obtained”, “identify the monitored or obtained content item”, “said act of deriving comprises deriving two or more fingerprints of the content item”, and “said act

1 *of interrogating the list of content items utilizes the two or more fingerprints*” must be
2 shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

3 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in
4 reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended
5 replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate
6 prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure
7 number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure
8 is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,
9 and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate
10 changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for
11 consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering
12 of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an
13 application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New
14 Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,
15 the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next
16 Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the amendment of 5/1/08 introduces new matter. See Objection to the Specification below. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

The specification fails to provide proper antecedent basis for the recitations of “*monitoring or analyzing a content item*”, “*a list of content items... comprising a subset of content items designated as active*”, “*the list of content items being respectively associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the content items themselves*”, “*deriving at least one fingerprint*”, “*each item on the list of content items being respectively associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the respective content item itself*”, “*receiving a playlist, the playlist identifying ...*”, “*based at least in part on the playlist*”, “*updating the list of content items by adding at least a plurality of content items and removing at least a plurality of content items, but not all of the content items from the list*”; “*deriving at least one fingerprint from a content item monitored or analyzed from the network*”; “*interrogating the list of content items with at least one*

1 *derived fingerprint”, “receiving a list of content items, with each item on the list of*
2 *content items being associated with one or more fingerprints derived from the*
3 *respective content item itself”, “adding and deleting entries in a table or data structure*
4 *according to the list of content items”; “identifying a subset of the limited list of content*
5 *items as active content items, the subset being associated with those content items*
6 *being subject to updates”; “deriving at least one fingerprint from a content item*
7 *monitored or obtained”, “identify the monitored or obtained content item”, “said act of*
8 *deriving comprises deriving two or more fingerprints of the content item”, and “said act*
9 *of interrogating the list of content items utilizes the two or more fingerprints”.*

10
11 ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

12
13 **The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:**

14 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
15 making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
16 art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
17 set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
18

19 **Claims 30, 36 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as**
20 **failing to comply with the written description requirement.** The claim(s) contains
21 subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to
22 reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the
23 application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has not
24 pointed out where the new (or amended) claim is supported, nor does there appear to

1 be a written description of the claim limitations in the application as filed (see above
2 objection to the specification).

3
4 The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

5 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
6 claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7
8 Claims 30, 40 – 45, and 52 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second
9 paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the
10 subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11 Specifically, these claims comprise recitations of “active”, such as within the
12 phrases “content items designated as active” [claim 30] and “content items as active
13 content items” [claim 40]. The examiner notes that a standard meaning for “active”
14 when used to describe content items does not exist amongst those of ordinary skill in
15 the art. It is noted that an applicant can define in the claims what they regard as their
16 invention essentially in whatever terms they choose so long as any special meaning
17 assigned to a term is clearly set forth in the specification. In the instant case, however,
18 the applicant fails to provide a definition for “active” as would be applied to content
19 items as well as the applicant fails to clearly set forth within the applicant's specification
20 the meaning of “active” as would be applied to content items. Thus, the scope of 30, 40
21 – 45, and 52 – 55 is rendered unclear. For the purpose of examination, the examiner
22 presumes the reference to the term “active”, nominally describing a content item, to
23 mean the intention of some sort of activity, operation, capability, or expression to be
24 associated with the content item.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 30, and 36 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Specifically regarding claims 30, 36, 38, and 40 – 55, they are rejected as they comprise a method which fails to (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or transforms or (2) transform a particular article to a different state or thing.

Specifically regarding claims 37 and 39, they fail to demonstrate a machine imposing meaningful limits on the scope of claims 1 – 15. Essentially, these claims comprise merely field-of-use limitations wherein the method of claims 1 – 15 is tied to instructions. Such limitations are insufficient to render an otherwise ineligible method claim patent-eligible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious

1 *at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said*
2 *subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention*
3 *was made.*

4
5
6 **Claims 30 and 36 – 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**
7 **unpatentable over Schmelzer, “Copyright Detection and Protection System and**
8 **Method”, U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0037010 in view of Razdan, “Real-time,**
9 **Distributed, Transactional, Hybrid Watermarking Method to Provide Trace-ability**
10 **and Copyright Protection of Digital Content in Peer-to-Peer Networks”, U.S.**
11 **Patent Publication 2002/0168082.**

12
13 Regarding claim 30, Schmelzer discloses:
14 *maintaining a limited list of content items, the list comprising a subset of content*
15 *items designated as active, the list of content items being respectively associated with*
16 *one or more fingerprints derived from the content items themselves (par. 6, 7, 34 –*
17 *herein it is shown that the list comprises registered and monitored (i.e. “active”)*
18 *copyrighted works, a subset of all copyrighted works);*
19 *deriving at least one fingerprint from a content item monitored or analyzed from*
20 *the network; and interrogating the limited list of content items with at least one*
21 *fingerprint to identify the monitored content item (par. 34)*

22 Schmelzer does not appear to explicitly disclose that a network within a content
23 fingerprinting system may comprise broadcast network. Razdan discloses that

1 fingerprinting systems may comprise broadcast networks that broadcast content (par.
2 32, 37, 38). It would have been obvious to recognize the broadcasting features as
3 found within prior art fingerprinting systems such as Razdan within the fingerprinting
4 system of Schmelzer. This would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in
5 the art would have been motivated by the advantages of a more flexible and socially
6 relevant system.

7
8 Regarding claims 36 – 55, they are rejected, at least for the same reasons as
9 claim 30, and furthermore because the prior art combination enables the features of
10 *receiving a list of content items...storing the list of content items in a table or data*
11 *structure; receiving a content item, the content item comprising audio or video; deriving*
12 *a fingerprint from the content item itself...communicating a signal representing at least*
13 *the identified content item to a remote device* (Schmelzer, par. 33, 34, 79; fig. 1:121,
14 123; par. 47), *“updating the list of content items by adding at least a plurality of content*
15 *items and removing at least a plurality of content items, but not all of the content items*
16 *from the list” and “adding and deleting entries in a table or data structure according to*
17 *the list of content items”* (Schmelzer, par. 67, 83 – herein content items are enabled to
18 be updated - it is noted that it was well known by those of ordinary skill in the art that
19 updating may comprise removing information) *“deriving at least one fingerprint from a*
20 *content item monitored or analyzed from the network”*; *“receiving a list of content items,*
21 *with each item on the list of content items being associated with one or more*
22 *fingerprints derived from the respective content item itself”*, *“interrogating the list of*

1 *content items with at least one derived fingerprint*", "said act of deriving comprises
2 *deriving two or more fingerprints of the content item*", "said act of interrogating the list of
3 *content items utilizes the two or more fingerprints*" (fig. 2, 4, 6 - herein a plurality of
4 identifiers ("fingerprints") are derived and used for identifying listed content items).

5
6
7 ***Response to Arguments***

8
9 Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered
10 but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

11
12 Applicant's arguments filed 5/12/09 have been fully considered but they are not
13 persuasive.

14
15 *Applicant argues or asserts essentially that:*

16 First, the final Office Action's characterization overstates Schmelzer's teachings
17 and the reasonable inferences that should be drawn there from. For example,
18 Schmelzer does not designate a subset of the content items represented on the list of
19 content item as "active".

20 Second, the final Office Action's characterization misinterprets claim 30. Claim 30
21 requires that a subset of the maintained list of content items be designated as "active".
22 The final Office Action, instead, would say that the entire maintained list include a

"subset" of all possible copyright works. See the final Office Action, page 7, lines 1-3.
Indeed, Schmelzer does not designate a subset of the maintained list of content items
as "active," as required by claim 30. (Brief, pg. 7)

Examiner respectfully responds:

First, the examiner respectfully notes that claim 30 is a method claim comprising
the step of "maintaining a list of content items". The examiner points out that
designating "*a subset of the content items represented on the list of content item as
"active"*" is not a method step. Thus, applicant's assertion that the prior art *does not
designate a subset of the content items represented on the list of content item as
"active"* is irrelevant. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to
show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which
applicant relies (i.e., *designate a subset of the content items represented on the list of
content item as "active"*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims
are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read
into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.
1993).

Furthermore, the examiner respectfully notes that the mere description of content
as "active" (i.e. the applicant is calling content items on a list by the name "active") fails
to impart any functional limitation to the claimed method. Thus, the examiner finds the
applicant's assertions unpersuasive.

1 Second, the examiner respectfully notes that the claims do not recite designating
2 “a subset of the maintained list of content items as "active". In response to applicant's
3 argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is
4 noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., designate a subset of the
5 maintained list of content items as "active,") are not recited in the rejected claim(s).
6 Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the
7 specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26
8 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

9 The examiner points out that the claim recites maintaining a list of content items.
10 As noted within the rejection, the prior art discloses maintaining such a list of registered
11 content items, wherein it is explicitly shown within the prior art that the registered
12 content items comprising the list are a subset of existing copyrighted content
13 (Schmelzer, par. 6, 7, 34).

14
15
16 *Applicant argues or asserts essentially that:*

17 Claim 40 recites - in combination with other features - identifying a subset of a list
18 of content items as active content items, the subset being associated with those content
19 items being subject to updates.

20 ... Indeed, there is no analysis supporting the rejection of claim 40, including the
21 features of a "subset being associated with those content items being subject to
22 updates". (Brief, pg. 8 – see also applicant's similar assertion on pg. 9)

1

2 *Examiner respectfully responds:*

3 The rejection explicitly shows that the list of content items is updated (e.g. see
4 Final Rejection, 7/24/08, pg. 7, 8). Thus, the examiner respectfully notes that
5 applicant's allegation that the rejection fails to support the rejection of the language (i.e.
6 the subset being associated with those content items being subject to updates) clearly
7 appears unpersuasive.

8 Furthermore, the examiner respectfully notes that the applicant's nominal
9 description of content as "subject to updates" fails to impart any functional limitation to
10 the claimed method. Thus, the examiner finds the applicant's assertions that the prior
11 art fails to meet the claimed limitations to be unpersuasive.

12

13 *Applicant argues or asserts essentially that:*

14 Indeed, the above passages say nothing of updating the list of content items
15 based at least in part on a received playlist (which playlist indicates content items to be
16 transmitted through the network during a predetermined time period).

17 Second, the cited passages (paragraphs 67 and 83) say nothing of updating the
18 list of content items by adding at least a plurality of content items and removing at least
19 a plurality of content items. At best, the passages talk about receiving and storing
20 fingerprint identifiers (see paragraph 83). These passages say nothing of adding a
21 plurality of content items and removing a plurality of content items. Here, again, the final

Office Action overstates the teaching of Schmelzer. (Brief, pg. 11, see also similar argument on pg. 12).

Examiner respectfully responds:

The examiner respectfully notes that the rejection explicitly directs the applicant to relevant portions of the prior art wherein it is clearly seen that content providers submit a plurality or "lists" of copyrighted content items to be registered or maintained with the content protection system (e.g. see Schmelzer, par. 6, 7, 34, 78, 79). Additionally, the rejection furthermore details the fact that the prior art discloses the updating of the content protections system's database or "list" of content items by virtue of received plurality of content items from the content providers (e.g. see Schmelzer, par. 34, 67, 79, 83). Thus, the examiner notes that the rejection clearly shows that the prior art enables updating a list of content items by adding at least a plurality of content items, wherein the updating is based at least in part on a received playlist (which playlist indicates content items to be transmitted through the network during a predetermined time period). Additionally, the examiner notes that the applicant's intended use recitation (i.e. essentially - *which playlist indicates content items to be transmitted through the network during a predetermined time period*) fails to further add limiting method steps and therefore is irrelevant to the claimed method.

Furthermore, regarding the recitation that the updating of the list comprises "removing at least a plurality of content items" from the list, the examiner notes that the rejection clearly stated "*it was well known by those of ordinary skill in the art that*

1 *updating may comprise removing information*" (e.g. see Final Rejection, 7/24/08, pg. 8).
2 Thus, the rejection clearly showed that the prior art enables "removing at least a
3 plurality of content items".

4 However, the applicant fails to adequately traverse the finding that "*it was well*
5 *known by those of ordinary skill in the art that updating may comprise removing*
6 *information*". Namely, the applicant fails to specifically point out the supposed errors in
7 the examiner's action, including stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be
8 common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b). See also
9 Chevenard, 139 F.2d at 713, 60 USPQ at 241 ("[I]n the absence of any demand by
10 appellant for the examiner to produce authority for his statement, we will not consider
11 this contention.").

12 Thus, the examiner notes for the record that should clearly indicate in the next
13 Office action that the fact that "*it was well known by those of ordinary skill in the art that*
14 *updating may comprise removing information*" is taken to be admitted prior art because
15 applicant fails to adequately traverse the examiner's assertion.

16
17 *Applicant argues or asserts essentially that:*

18 We respectfully submit that the claims have adequate written description support.
19 Indeed, support for the claims can be found throughout the application including, e.g.,
20 page 10, line 1 - page 12, line 7; Fig. 1; and Fig. 2. These sections and figures describe
21 methods and. (Brief, pg. 13).

22

1 *Examiner respectfully responds:*

2 The examiner respectfully notes that the applicant's arguments comprise only an
3 allegation that the added claim recitations are supported within the applicant's original
4 disclosure. The applicant fails to specifically point out such support for the claim
5 amendments as required. For this reason at least, the examiner notes that the
6 applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

7

8 ***Conclusion***

9

10 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
11 applicant's disclosure:

12 **See Notice of References Cited.**

13

14 A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90
15 days) from the mailing date of this communication.

16 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
17 examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-
18 7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

19 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
20 supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone
21 number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)
22 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2437

1 Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
2 Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
3 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
4 Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
5 For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should
6 you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
7 Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

8 /Nasser G Moazzami/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

9
10 J. Williams
11 AU 2137
12